

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket Nos. 43491/43492/43563

STATE OF IDAHO,) 2016 Unpublished Opinion No. 513
)
Plaintiff-Respondent,) Filed: April 29, 2016
)
v.) Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
)
JASON L. WILLIAMS,) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
) OPINION AND SHALL NOT
Defendant-Appellant.) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
)
_____)

Appeal from the District Court of the First Judicial District, State of Idaho, Bonner County, Hon. Barbara A. Buchanan, District Judge; and appeal from the District Court of the First Judicial District, State of Idaho, Kootenai County, Hon. Lansing L. Haynes, District Judge.

Orders revoking probation, affirmed; judgment of conviction and unified sentence of five years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, for burglary, affirmed.

Sara B. Thomas, State Appellate Public Defender; Jenny C. Swinford, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Lori A. Fleming, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

Before MELANSON, Chief Judge; GUTIERREZ, Judge;
and GRATTON, Judge

PER CURIAM

In Docket No. 43491, Jason L. Williams pled guilty to six counts of grand theft, Idaho Code §§ 18-2403(1), 18-2407(1)(b)(1). The district court imposed concurrent unified sentences of five years, with two years determinate, and retained jurisdiction. Two days later, in Docket No. 43563, Williams pled guilty to burglary, I.C. § 18-1401, and the district court imposed a concurrent unified sentence of six years, with three years determinate, but after a period of retained jurisdiction, suspended the sentences and placed Williams on probation. Subsequently,

Williams pled guilty to burglary in Docket No. 43492 and admitted to violating the terms of his probation in Docket Nos. 43491 and 43563. The district court consequently revoked probation and ordered execution of the underlying sentences and imposed a concurrent unified sentence of five years, with two years determinate, in Docket No. 43492. Williams appeals, contending that the district court abused its discretion in revoking probation in Docket Nos. 43491 and 43563 and that his sentence in Docket No. 43492 is excessive.

It is within the trial court's discretion to revoke probation if any of the terms and conditions of the probation have been violated. I.C. §§ 19-2603, 20-222; *State v. Beckett*, 122 Idaho 324, 325, 834 P.2d 326, 327 (Ct. App. 1992); *State v. Adams*, 115 Idaho 1053, 1054, 772 P.2d 260, 261 (Ct. App. 1989); *State v. Hass*, 114 Idaho 554, 558, 758 P.2d 713, 717 (Ct. App. 1988). In determining whether to revoke probation a court must examine whether the probation is achieving the goal of rehabilitation and consistent with the protection of society. *State v. Upton*, 127 Idaho 274, 275, 899 P.2d 984, 985 (Ct. App. 1995); *Beckett*, 122 Idaho at 325, 834 P.2d at 327; *Hass*, 114 Idaho at 558, 758 P.2d at 717. The court may, after a probation violation has been established, order that the suspended sentence be executed or, in the alternative, the court is authorized under Idaho Criminal Rule 35 to reduce the sentence. *Beckett*, 122 Idaho at 325, 834 P.2d at 327; *State v. Marks*, 116 Idaho 976, 977, 783 P.2d 315, 316 (Ct. App. 1989). The court may also order a period of retained jurisdiction. *State v. Urrabazo*, 150 Idaho 158, 162, 244 P.3d 1244, 1248 (2010). A decision to revoke probation will be disturbed on appeal only upon a showing that the trial court abused its discretion. *Beckett*, 122 Idaho at 325, 834 P.2d at 327. In reviewing the propriety of a probation revocation, the focus of the inquiry is the conduct underlying the trial court's decision to revoke probation. *State v. Morgan*, 153 Idaho 618, 621, 288 P.3d 835, 838 (Ct. App. 2012). Thus, this Court will consider the elements of the record before the trial court relevant to the revocation of probation issues which are properly made part of the record on appeal. *Id.*

Sentencing is also a matter for the trial court's discretion. Both our standard of review and the factors to be considered in evaluating the reasonableness of a sentence are well established and need not be repeated here. See *State v. Hernandez*, 121 Idaho 114, 117-18, 822 P.2d 1011, 1014-15 (Ct. App. 1991); *State v. Lopez*, 106 Idaho 447, 449-51, 680 P.2d 869, 871-73 (Ct. App. 1984); *State v. Toohill*, 103 Idaho 565, 568, 650 P.2d 707, 710 (Ct. App. 1982).

When reviewing the length of a sentence, we consider the defendant's entire sentence. *State v. Oliver*, 144 Idaho 722, 726, 170 P.3d 387, 391 (2007).

When we review a sentence that is ordered into execution following a period of probation, we will examine the entire record encompassing events before and after the original judgment. *State v. Hanington*, 148 Idaho 26, 29, 218 P.3d 5, 8 (Ct. App. 2009). We base our review upon the facts existing when the sentence was imposed as well as events occurring between the original sentencing and the revocation of probation. *Id.* Thus, this Court will consider the elements of the record before the trial court that are properly made part of the record on appeal and are relevant to the defendant's contention that the trial court should have reduced the sentence sua sponte upon revocation of probation. *Morgan*, 153 Idaho at 621, 288 P.3d at 838.

Applying the foregoing standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion either in revoking probation or in ordering execution of Williams' sentences without modification. Therefore, the orders revoking probation and directing execution of Williams' previously suspended sentences in Docket Nos. 43491 ad 43563 and the judgment of conviction and sentence in Docket No. 43492 are affirmed.